

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

J.M.M., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ANDREA HERNANDEZ, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01197-JAD-NJK

ORDER

The lead Plaintiffs in this case are minors. The Court has previously advised counsel of the requirements of Special Order No. 108, including that only a minor's initials be provided in Court filings. *See* Docket Nos. 18, 35, 59; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a)(3). The Court has warned counsel three times already in this case - including one time less than a week ago - that the Court expects strict compliance with that requirement in the future, and that failure to do so may result in sanctions. *See* Docket Nos. 18, 35, 59 (citing *Davis v. Clark County Sch. Dist.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 128937, *5 n.3 (D. Nev. Sept. 9, 2013)). Notwithstanding the above orders, special order, and applicable Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, counsel have yet again filed on the public docket a document revealing the minor Plaintiffs' full names in the body of the document. Docket No. 60-1.

It should not be difficult for counsel to follow clear Court orders and rules of practice. *See, e.g., Dela Rosa v. Scottsdale Memorial Health Sys., Inc.*, 136 F.3d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 1998) ("we expect an attorney practicing law in federal court to become familiar with and follow rules applicable to practice in this court"). On October 13, 2015, the Court issued its third order reminding counsel of the requirement to use only minors' initials in court filings, and specifically stated, "This is the FINAL

1 warning to counsel. All counsel are required to use only initials for the minor Plaintiffs in their Court
2 filings. Counsel should anticipate a significant Court sanction if they do not comply in the future.”
3 Docket No. 59 at 1. Despite this warning, however, counsel has again filed a document containing the
4 minor plaintiffs’ names - only three days after the Court issued its most recent warning.

5 Accordingly,

6 The Court **ORDERS** the Clerk’s Office to seal the document at Docket No. 60, including the
7 attachment Docket No. 60-1.

8 The Court further **ORDERS** Plaintiffs’ counsel to file, no later than October 21, 2015, the
9 motion at Docket No. 60, along with the properly redacted attachment, on the Court’s docket.

10 The Court further **ORDERS** Plaintiffs’ counsel to show cause in writing, no later than October
11 27, 2015, why the Court should not issue sanctions against counsel for failure to comply with a Court
12 order, up to and including a Court fine of up to \$5,000, pursuant to Local Rule IA 4-1 and/or the Court’s
13 inherent authority.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: October 19, 2015.

16
17 
18 NANCY J. KOPPE
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28